

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

SYLVIA MINES-JONES,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CADILLAC

Defendant.

2:19-CV-12400-TGB

**ORDER GRANTING
APPLICATION TO PROCEED
IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND
SUMMARILY DISMISSING
CASE**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Sylvia Mines-Jones' Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. ECF No. 2. Plaintiff indicates that she has no source of income, has no savings, and relies on Section 8 housing. Accordingly, Plaintiff's *IFP* application (ECF No. 2) is **GRANTED**. However, because the Complaint is frivolous and fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted, the Court will **DISMISS** the Complaint.

When a person seeks to proceed in court without prepayment of fees (*in forma pauperis*), the Court must determine whether the action is "frivolous" or "fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii). If so, the Court must dismiss the Complaint.

Id. An action is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Nietzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1990).

Plaintiff’s Complaint is a rambling string of disjointed, convoluted, and nonsensical statements ranging from “[t]he global economic summit did a savage domination,” and “biochemical warfare,” to “Elsa Frozen Owner Hallmark Industries anatomy physiology murder plot” and “counterfeiting bio-tech pirating murder meters.” ECF No. 1. The Court cannot even begin to discern what Plaintiff is alleging or why she is seeking upwards of \$600 million from Cadillac. Plaintiff’s Complaint has no comprehensible basis in law or fact. It therefore fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted and is frivolous. For these reasons, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* but **DISMISSES** the Complaint **WITH PREJUDICE**. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: December 30, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

/s/Terrence G. Berg

TERRENCE G. BERG

United States District Judge